



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,956

10/15/2003

Mitch Fredrick Singer

113748-4837US

8803

27189

7590

07/22/2009

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP

530 B STREET

SUITE 2100

SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

DUNN, DARRIN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/22/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com

PTONotifications@procopio.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/686,956	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SINGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DARRIN DUNN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/18/2008</u>   <u>09/02/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2121

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Office Action is responsive to the communication filed on 03/26/2009.
2. Claims 1-3 and 5-39 are pending.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement[s] (IDS) submitted on 12/18/2008 and 09/02/2008 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2121

6. Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges et al. (USPN 20020157002) in view over Foster et al. (USPN 20030198351) and in further view over Kontio et al. (USPN 7421411)

7. As per claim 1, Messerges et al. teaches a method of presenting content data, comprising:

receiving at a server device ([0042], [0054] e.g., domain authority, content provider, or other entity) a present request indicating locked content data ([0042] e.g., content package) from a client ([0050] e.g. user device) connected to a hub network ([Figure 2]);

checking a license corresponding to said locked content data to determine if said license permits said client to present said locked content data ([0049], [0060-61] e.g., verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table),

wherein said locked content data is a bound instance if said license permits presentation of said locked content data by said client connected to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], [Figure 4] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain. Content is cryptographically bound to the domain ID), and

wherein the bound instance of said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain); and

presenting said locked content data through a presentation component connected to said client when said locked content data is a bound instance ([0059-63], [Figure 3] e.g., before content may be played, the content manager invokes the core digital rights management software)

Art Unit: 2121

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

**1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.**

**2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and**

**3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the server device connected to the hub network**

Foster et al. teaches **1]** ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. Authorizers are configured to authorize the addition of the new device. )

**2]** ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data, i.e., server may render content in the same manner as the client because devices are both authorizers and servers. It is understood that a participating device may render content. Since a device may be a server, it is understood that a server acts as a client (e.g., another device) because its is operable to play content in the same way as another device. It is interpreted that sharing a common function between a server and client enables a server to act as a client)

**3]** ([0078], [0080] lines 9-11] e.g., content is freely shared among devices, wherein a device may be a server and authorizer )

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

Art Unit: 2121

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance but does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Kontio et al. teaches wherein content data is changed to a discrete instance ([COL 34 lines 45-50] e.g. *Discrete instance, not defined, is interpreted as individually distinct*. Here, a copy is made that is classified as dormant, i.e., no rights and therefore unplayable, and is distinct than that of the original, i.e., classified as having rights and playable. The change occurs via copying the content and characterizing it as dormant when communication with a clearinghouse is not established. The copy is therefore distinct because of differences in rights, usability, and in form (e.g., copied version with different rights or no rights until established)) when locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (supra Fosters, [0079]. As applied to Messerges, such dormant, copied content could be bound to another network in the same way as the first copy is bound to its network)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges to enable the bounded version to be duplicated and distributed. It is foreseeable that a user would want to transfer a copy to another network. There is therefore a need to regulate what rights are assigned to this version, i.e., dormant version. Once a user establishes communication with a clearinghouse, it is obvious that at that point a user may

Art Unit: 2121

acquire specific rights to use the copy. As applied to Messerges, such copied content may be changed from dormant to active and tied to another network (e.g. supra Messerges -0036-37])

8. As per claim 2, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said locked content data and said license corresponding to said locked content data are stored on a the server device ([0042-49] e.g., requested content is provided from a content provider. The requested content, as part of the content package, further includes an electronic rights table, a rights document, encrypted content....The objects of the content package may optionally be provided by two files – a license file, encoded rights table, and an encrypted content, etc. As modified by Foster, such locked content would be stored on a participating device that functions as both a server and authorizer, supra Foster [COL [0080]))

9. As per claim 3, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 2, wherein: presenting said locked content data includes decrypting said locked content data to produce output content data and sending said output content data to said presentation component ([0060-62])

10. As per claim 5, Messerges et al. teaches he method of claim 1, wherein: checking said license includes sending a confirm license request to said server from said client ([0060-61] e.g., a content package is opened via verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table....As applied to Foster, a server| authorizer device includes the aforementioned function of checking a license prior to distributing content to the participating device)

Art Unit: 2121

11. As per claim 6, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein: presenting said locked content data includes receiving output content data streamed from said server device to said client ([0062] e.g., streaming content)

12. As per claim 7, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising: checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server application); wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said server device ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be provided via a web server. As applied, to Foster, a participating device functions as both server and authorizer. It is obvious to incorporate the functions of an external server, as per Messerges, into the device server|authorizer, as per Foster)

13. As per claim 8, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said client ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

14. As per claim 9, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said locked content data is media data ([0031])

15. As per claim 10, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component is integral to said client ([Figure 3- phones including a display])



Art Unit: 2121

16. As per claim 11, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component is external to said client ([Figure 3- phones include an integrated, external display])

17. As per claim 12, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component includes a television ([0003], [0040], [Figure 5- set-top box])

18. As per claim 13, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component includes an audio speaker system ([0028], [Figure 5])

19. As per claim 14, Messerges et al. teaches a method of presenting content data, comprising:

receiving at a server connected to a hub network a present request indicating locked content data and indicating to a client connected to said hub network to present the content data ([0060-62]);

checking a license corresponding to said locked content data to determine if said license permits said server to present said locked content data through said client ([0060-61] e.g., verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table),

wherein said locked content data is a bound instance if said license permits presentation of said locked content data by said server through said client connected to a-the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], [Figure 4] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain. Content is cryptographically bound to the domain ID), and

wherein the bound instance of said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is

Art Unit: 2121

bound to the device domain); and

presenting said locked content data through a presentation component connected to said client when said locked content data is a bound instance ([0059-63], [Figure 3] e.g, before content may be played, the content manager invokes the core digital rights management software)

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

**1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.**

**2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and**

**3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the server device connected to the hub network**

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client. )

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

3] ([0080] lines 9-11))

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance but does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g.,

Art Unit: 2121

obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy);

Kontio et al., teaches wherein content data is changed to a discrete instance ([COL 34 lines 45-50] e.g. Discrete instance, not defined, is interpreted as individually distinct. Here, a copy is made that is classified as dormant, i.e., no rights and therefore unplayable, and is distinct than that of the original, i.e., classified as having rights and playable. The change occurs via copying the content and labeling it dormant when communication with a clearinghouse is not established. The copy is therefore distinct because of differences in rights, usability, and in form (e.g., copied version with different rights or no rights until established)) when locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (supra Fosters, [0079])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges to enable the bounded version to be duplicated and distributed. It is foreseeable that a user would want to transfer a copy to another network. There is therefore a need to regulate what rights are assigned to this version, i.e., dormant version. Once a user establishes communication with a clearinghouse, it is obvious that at that point a user may acquire specific rights to use the copy.

20. As per claim 15, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein: streaming data to said client includes streaming locked content data to said client ([0062])

21. As per claim 16, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising: decrypting said locked content data ([0060])

Art Unit: 2121

22. As per claim 17, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein: said present request is received from said client ([0042], [0060])

23. As per claim 18, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising: checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server application);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said server ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be provided via a web server)

24. Claims 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges et al. (USPN 20020157002 A1) in view over Russell et al. (20020069420), in view over Foster et al. (USPN 20030198351), and in further view over Kontio et al. (USPN 7421411)

25. As per claim 19, Messerges et al. teaches a method of copying content data, comprising: receiving in a hub network a request indicating locked content data ([0031], [0045], [0053] e.g. users may wish to copy newly purchased content packages), ; and

copying said locked content data to produce a copy of said locked content data when said locked content data is a bound instance with a corresponding license that is bound to said hub network ([0062] e.g., streaming, copying, loaning, or moving content to other trusted devices);

wherein the bound instance if said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0062-64] e.g., trusted devices are interpreted as belonging to the authorized domain)

Art Unit: 2121

However, Messerges et al. does not teach a copy request and copying said locked content data to produce a copy of said locked content data. Messerges teaches said locked content data is a bound instance with a corresponding license that is bound to said hub network ([0062] e.g., streaming, copying, loaning, or moving content to other trusted devices). Messerges teaches a request for locked content data from a content provider ([0042]) Russell et al. teaches a main server containing copy of each content item ([0074], [0080])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to include a server copy of protected content for distribution. Since it is foreseeable that users would request a replacement of content that may have been corrupted, it would be necessary to provide a copy of the original content to the user opposed to sending the original content. Russell et al. illustrates that copies of content are maintained, and therefore it would have been obvious to enable the user to receive a copy of requested content.

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

**1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.**

**2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and**

Foster et al. teaches **1]** ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client. )

**2]** ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is

Art Unit: 2121

distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al. does not teach **wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network;**

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance but does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy);

Kontio et al.. teaches wherein content data is changed to a discrete instance ([COL 34 lines 45-50] e.g. Discrete instance, not defined, is interpreted as individually distinct. Here, a copy is made that is classified as dormant, i.e., no rights and therefore unplayable, and is distinct than that of the original, i.e., classified as having rights and playable. The change occurs via copying the content and labeling it dormant when communication with a clearinghouse is not established. The copy is therefore distinct because of differences in rights, usability, and in form (e.g., copied version with different rights or no rights until established)) when locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (supra Fosters, [0079])

Art Unit: 2121

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges to enable the bounded version to be duplicated and distributed. It is foreseeable that a user would want to transfer a copy to another network. There is therefore a need to regulate what rights are assigned to this version, i.e., dormant version. Once a user establishes communication with a clearinghouse, it is obvious that at that point a user may acquire specific rights to use the copy.

26. As per claim 20, Messerges, as modified, teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising:

checking said license to determine if said license permits said locked content data to be copied ([0007] e.g., users request copies, [0042], [0049] e.g., it is interpreted that in a digital rights management system that a user is verified prior to being provided digital content. As modified, a copy request would additionally include a verification of a user's permission)

27. As per claim 21 Russell et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising:

requesting a new license from a server for said copy of said locked content data ([0037] e.g., new license); wherein said server is in said hub network and connected to said client (e.g., Messerges, as modified, teaches providing content to a network such that content is bound to the network. A server providing such content via the network is understood as being in a hub network)

28. As per claim 22, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising:

sending said copy of said locked content data to a device that is not a member of said hub network ([0080] e.g., trusted devices outside the domain may be provided content if appropriate)

Art Unit: 2121

content protocol are supplied. As modified, it is interpreted that a content provider may provide copies to a device outside the authorized domain)

29. As per claim 23, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising: sending said copy of said locked content data to a client that is a member of said hub network but is not connected to said hub network ([0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

30. As per claim 24, Russell et al. teaches sending a new license to a client that is a member of said hub network but is not connected to said hub network ([0037] e.g., it is interpreted that a new license may be associated with a portable device. [0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

31. As per claim 25, As per claim 8, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:



Art Unit: 2121

checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said client ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

32. As per claim 26, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches a method of distributing content data, comprising:

receiving from a providing device connected to a hub network, and at a receiving device a copy of locked content data that is a bound instance bound to said hub network ([Figure 1], [Figure 5], ([0042], [0049] e.g., requested content, i.e., receiving at a client, a request for locked content data, i.e., encrypted content file)

requesting a new license for said copy of locked content data (e.g., as modified in view of Russell, new license requests and receiving copies could be part of a user request for content. Please see Russell [0010], [0037], [0074]); and

receiving said new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance bound to said hub network (e.g., Messerges teaches binding content to a network, which as modified with Russell, provides that copies of content and associated licenses are bound as well. Please see Messerges ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain);

wherein the bound instance of said copy of locked content data and the new license corresponding to said copy of locked content data are bound to the hub network (e.g., Messerges teaches [0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain);

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

**1] wherein the providing device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the providing device to the hub network.**

Art Unit: 2121

**2] wherein the providing device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and**

**3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the providing device connected to the hub network**

Foster et al. teaches **1]** ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client. )

**2]** ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

**3]** ([0080] lines 9-11))

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance but does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy);

Kontio et al.. teaches wherein content data is changed to a discrete instance ([COL 34 lines 45-50] e.g. Discrete instance, not defined, is interpreted as individually distinct. Here, a copy is made that is classified as dormant, i.e., no rights and therefore unplayable, and is distinct than that of the original, i.e., classified as having rights and playable. The change occurs via

Art Unit: 2121

copying the content and labeling it dormant when communication with a clearinghouse is not established. The copy is therefore distinct because of differences in rights, usability, and in form (e.g., copied version with different rights or no rights until established)) when locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (supra Fosters, [0079])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges to enable the bounded version to be duplicated and distributed. It is foreseeable that a user would want to transfer a copy to another network. There is therefore a need to regulate what rights are assigned to this version, i.e., dormant version. Once a user establishes communication with a clearinghouse, it is obvious that at that point a user may acquire specific rights to use the copy.

33. As per claim 27, Russell et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein: said providing device is a client in said hub network ([0107] e.g., user may copy and store the copy on another computer)

34. As per claim 28, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein: said providing device is a server in said hub network ([Figure 2- element 210, 216 (e.g., computer acting as a server in view of Russell)

35. Claims 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges et al. (USPN 20020157002 A1), in view over Foster et al. (USPN 20030198351), and in further view over Kontio et al. (USPN 7421411) , in view over Foster Russell et al. (20020069420), and in further view of Peinado et al. (USPN 20030217011)

Art Unit: 2121

36. As per claim 29, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach said new license is received from said client. Peinado et al. teaches a license store may be embodied in any other form so long as the license store performs the function of storing licenses in a location convenient for the DRM [0132])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to utilize a client as a license store. As a member of an authorized domain, the client is authorized to access protected content. Since several authorized clients are also present within the network, it would have been obvious to use a client as a convenient means of providing a license to another client computer.

37. As per claim 30, Russell et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26 wherein said new license is provided from a server in said hub network ([Figure 2- element 12])

38. As per claim 31, Russell et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26 wherein said new license is received from an external server that is not in said hub network ([Figure 2 - element 16])

39. As per claim 32, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said copy of locked content data has a corresponding license authority information stored on said providing device ([Figure 9], [0051], [0059], [0061], [0049] e.g., licensing authority, i.e., digital rights management software implements a content decoder to ask the content package manager to open a package. The content package is associated with a license)

said new license is received from a licensing authority indicated by said licensing authority information (e.g., Messerges et al., as modified by Russell et al, provides the ability to receive a

Art Unit: 2121

new license. The licensing authority information, i.e., package rights, provides access to such content)

40. As per claim 33, Messerges et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is not a member of said hub network ([0053], [0054] e.g., users may still request content from a provider via a user interface; however, such users outside the domain may not be able to access such content until such devices are registered with the domain)

41. As per claim 34, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is a member of a second hub network ([Figure 4 – elements 202<sub>1</sub> 202<sub>2</sub>], [0040])

and said new license of said copy of locked content data is bound to said second hub network but not to said hub network ([Figure 4], [0040])

42. As per claim 35, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is not connected to said hub network [0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

43. As per claim 36, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising:

Art Unit: 2121

checking a revocation list to determine whether said receiving device is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said receiving device ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

44. As per claim 37, Messerges, as modified, teaches a method of distributing content data, comprising:

receiving at a server connected to a hub network, and from a device a request for a new license for a copy of locked content data that is a bound instance bound to said hub network (e.g., Messerges, as modified by Russell, teaches binding content to a network where a user may request a new copy of content. The copy of the content would be bound to the network. See Messerges [0042-44]. See Russell [0037- providing copies], *supra* claim 19 discussion);

checking a root license stored on said server to determine if said root license permits said server to provide a new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance ([0042], [0049] content provider, i.e., root server. As modified, a user requesting a new license would be verified as to whether they are permitted access to content. Furthermore, permitting a license to be provided, as taught by Russell, would include checking for payment, i.e., permitting a license to be issued ([0106]) ; and creating said new license according to said root license ([0031], [0042] , [0059], [0061] e.g., providing associated rights and permission. Messerges in view of Russell teaches that users may acquire a new license, where a set usage rules is established. A request for a new license would include usage rule); sending said new license to said device ([0037 (e.g., Russell) teaches downloading a license, i.e., receiving a license),

Art Unit: 2121

wherein said new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance is bound to said hub network ([0060-63], [0037- 38], [0040], [Figure 4] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain.

Content is cryptographically bound to the domain ID),

wherein the bound instance of said copy of locked content data and the new license are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain. It is interpreted that content and associated license/usage rights are bound to the domain, in effect controlling who receives such content, i.e., registered with a domain, and how the content is rendered, i.e., set of usage rules - [0031])

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

**1] wherein the providing device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the providing device to the hub network.**

**2] wherein the providing device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and**

**3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the providing device connected to the hub network**

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client. )

**2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)**

**3] ([0080] lines 9-11))**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for

Art Unit: 2121

content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance but does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy);

Kontio et al. teaches wherein content data is changed to a discrete instance ([COL 34 lines 45-50] e.g. Discrete instance, not defined, is interpreted as individually distinct. Here, a copy is made that is classified as dormant, i.e., no rights and therefore unplayable, and is distinct than that of the original, i.e., classified as having rights and playable. The change occurs via copying the content and labeling it dormant when communication with a clearinghouse is not established. The copy is therefore distinct because of differences in rights, usability, and in form (e.g., copied version with different rights or no rights until established)) when locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (supra Fosters, [0079])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges to enable the bounded version to be duplicated and distributed. It is foreseeable that a user would want to transfer a copy to another network. There is therefore a need to regulate what rights are assigned to this version, i.e., dormant version. Once a user establishes communication with a clearinghouse, it is obvious that at that point a user may acquire specific rights to use the copy.



Art Unit: 2121

45. As per claim 38, Messerges, as modified, teaches the method of claim 37, where said device is not connected to said hub network ([0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

39. As per claim 39, Messerges et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising:

checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server application);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said server device ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be provided via a web server. As applied, to Foster, a participating device functions as both server and authorizer. It is obvious to incorporate the functions of an external server, as per Messerges, into the device server|authorizer, as per Foster)

### ***Response to Arguments***

40. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Response to Amendment***

41. Applicant's request for withdraw the U.S.C 112 2nd paragraph rejection is granted.

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2121

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARRIN DUNN whose telephone number is (571)270-1645.

The examiner can normally be reached on EST:M-R(8:00-5:00) 9/5/4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DD/  
07/13/09

Ramel Patesh  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Art unit 2121

/Ramesh B. Patel/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2121